

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT ' 3 2006

-7-

REMARKS

This is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on July 11, 2006, and in response to an Examiner interview on September 8, 2006. Claims 1-27 were pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. With this response, claims 1-5, 8-9, 10-11, and 21 are amended, and the remaining claims are unchanged in the application. In the interview, the Examiner indicated these amendments would likely overcome the art of record, but indicated that another search would be required.

At the bottom of page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-18, 20, 21 and 23-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Field et al. (GB 2,364,850). In making the rejection, and from the Examiner's response to Applicant's arguments in the previous amendment, it is apparent that the Examiner did not give any weight to the limitation "distributed" in the claims. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that the server-based system set out in the Field reference was a distributed processor.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. The present specification specifically states that a distributed processor means "a non-server based system...". Instead, it means "a processor residing on a device which may be part of a network but which is under the personal control of the user, rather than on a server, for example." Applicant thus submits that the term "distributed" in the claims carried a meaning and was in the claims as originally filed, and that meaning should have been considered by the Examiner.

Notwithstanding that fact, Applicant has now more specifically amended claim 1 to read "a voice data processor, configured to be under personal control of a user during voice data processing, ...". Similarly, claim 21 states "storing the voice messages at a non-server based voice message (VM) data store... for each new voice message, processing the new voice message at a non-server based processor...".

Applicant thus submits that the claims now more clearly distinguish over the Field reference. The Field reference discusses a server-based system. The system for processing calls in Field is expressly stated to be a server-based system. FIG. 2 in Field specifically shows that server 20 forms the basis of the system, and the detailed description is replete with references to

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

-8-

the fact that server 20, or the server-based system 10 supported by server 20, performs substantially all of the processing discussed therein. This is a fundamentally different type of system than that claimed by the present application.

There are many advantages to the present system being a distributed system, instead of a server-based system. A number of those were set out in Applicant's prior response. Briefly, some of the advantages include that the present system reduces cost and increases flexibility. It substantially eliminates the need for a system administrator, which is required in server-based systems.

Because the present invention claims a distributed system, it cannot be anticipated by the Field reference. Similarly, the present invention provides significant advantages over a server-based system. Thus, Applicant submits that the present claims are neither taught nor suggested by the references cited by the Examiner. Applicant thus submits that independent claims 1 and 21 are allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 21 are respectfully requested.

Applicant also submits that a number of the dependent claims are independently allowable. These claims were also set out at length in Applicants previous response. Briefly, dependent claims 4 and 24 claim a speaker model training component configured to train a speaker identification model (claim 4) and training a speaker identification model (claim 24). Field et al. neither teaches nor suggests any type of model training, whatsoever.

The text cited by the Examiner in Field, page 5, line 34 to page 7, line 25 is discussing how to process an incoming call. This has nothing to do with training models. The text does indicate that the system can be programmed to handle incoming calls according to a given procedure but there is no indication that models are trained using the system. The specific text quoted by the Examiner is in the context of processing an incoming call and has nothing to do with training. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 4 and 24 are independently allowable.

Dependent claim 11 specifically states that "the distributed voice data processor includes a summarization component that generates a summary of the voice message." In rejecting this claim, the Examiner cited the text at page 7, lines 14-24. This text describes an

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

-9-

audio indexer/prioritizer that "stores the transcription data and caller identification data which is processed by the transcriber module 32 and the ID tagger model 30, respectively, as well as the time of the call, the originating phone number, automatic number identification (ANI) if available, and e-mail address, in a preprogrammed manner, so as to allow the user to retrieve specific calls or messages from a particular party or those calls or messages which pertain to specific subject matter. Further, the audio indexer/prioritizer can be programmed to prioritize certain calls or messages and inform the user of such calls or messages." This simply does not teach summarizing a voice message. The fact that a user can retrieve calls that relate to a certain subject matter does not mean that the calls are summarized. In fact, the user could be performing a free text search, a keyword search, a string search on the full textual content of the messages, or any other type of information retrieval search, without having the voice messages summarized, in any way. Thus, simply saying the that user can retrieve voice messages that relate to a given subject matter does not teach that the voice messages are summarized.

In addition, claims 16 and 23 are independently allowable. Claims 16 and 23 claim "a rate changing input which, when actuated by a user, changes a speaking rate associated with the voice messages" (in claim 16), and "normalizing the speaking rate to a user-selected speaking rate" (in claim 23). This is nowhere taught or suggested by the Field reference. The specific language cited the Examiner discusses calculating a speaking rate, but there is no teaching or suggestion, what so ever, that the speaking rate is changed based on a user input. Thus, claims 16 and 23 are independently allowable.

In conclusion, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 23 are allowable over the references cited by the Examiner. Applicant further submits that dependent claims 2-20 and 23-27 are allowable both by virtue of their dependence on allowable independent claims and because they are independently allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-27 are respectfully requested.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

-10-

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Christopher L. Holt, Reg. No. 45,844
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

JRK:slg